

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

Applicant	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Amount Requested	\$27,800,000.00
------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------

Proposal Title	Permanente Creek Flood Protection	Total Proposal Cost	\$55,642,426.00
-----------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in the western portion of Santa Clara County, along Hale and Permanente Creeks in the cities of Mountain View, Cupertino, and Los Altos. The Project includes 5 components: 1) a 15-acre flood detention basin at Rancho San Antonio County Park; 2) a 5-acre flood detention basin at McKelvey Park; 3) a new diversion structure to improve the “flow split” at the Permanente Creek Diversion Channel; 4) Permanent Creek Channel Improvements; and 5) Hale Creek Channel Improvements. The proposed project is intended to improve the flow capacity of both Hale and Permanente Creeks and provide diversion of peak stormwater flows to detention basins to reduce flood risk.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	3/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	12/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	7/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			42

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Some construction tasks lack sufficient detail to support the project can be implemented or conflicting information is provided. For example, the project includes the addition of a 0.7-acre mini-park at McKelvey Park. However, there is no clear mention of the mini-park in Task 8.2 (Project Construction). There is some inconsistency in presenting the 5 project components. Although 4 of 5 project components are described as at 60% to 90% design, plans and specifications are submitted for one of the 5 project components. The work plan task numbering is inconsistent in some places. Proposed work may not be consistent with the basin plan.

BUDGET

The majority of tasks lack detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 of the PSP. With the exception of Tasks 7 and 8, the budget does not include detailed and specific budgets for each project element. For example, cost estimates are not broken down by project element and no hourly rates are provided by discipline for staff time. The supporting documentation provided for a majority of the proposed tasks could not be correlated with the costs provided in the detailed budget table (Table 4-3). The reviewer is directed to Appendix 4-1 for supporting documentation for many Tasks (including Task 1 and Tasks 3 through 6). However, it was not clear how the proposed costs are derived from the documents referenced.

SCHEDULE

Based upon the information provided by the applicant, it is unclear whether the schedule is reasonable or that construction can begin by August of 2013 as stated in the proposal. A score of 3 points is awarded as the criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Some tasks are shown as being complete by August 15th, 2013; however, the completion date does not appear to be reasonable. For example, permitting is shown as being completed by award date (shown on the schedule as a single day, August 15, 2013); however, the work plan indicates that “permits are currently being submitted and it is anticipated that these permits may be obtained in six to twelve months”. The schedule does not include a break out by component for Tasks 4, 6, 8.1, and 8.3. As such, it is not possible to evaluate the timeline for each of the components with any certainty. The schedule indicates December 15, 2017 for completion of the final report; however, the last construction project is expected to be completed on November 30, 2017 which does not leave enough time for a draft report and final report.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Monitoring targets are not appropriate for the benefits claimed. Only one numeric target is provided, removing 1664 homes from the 100-year floodplain. Proof of project completion and submittal of appropriate paperwork to FEMA is the measurement tool provided. Proof of project completion and submittal paperwork to FEMA is not a measurement tool. Numeric targets are not provided for the remaining 5 project goals.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The technical justification cannot be determined due to lack of documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project(s) and/or physical benefits are not well described. The applicant does not address why the project was selected from the 26 total project alternatives detailed in the Permanent Creek Planning Study Report (PSR, Att. 3, 2 of 4). The applicant does not address how the proposed project relates to the project recommended in the PSR. The recommended proposal and the project submitted with the application appear to be markedly different. Design plans for only one project component are provided (RSACP), although 3 of the 4 remaining components are at the 60% to 90% great design (pg. 3-21). Finally, Tables 7-1a and b are not consistent with the benefits claimed elsewhere in the proposal regarding the number of homes/structures to be protected by the project.

BENEFITS AND COSTS ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a low level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation. Total project cost is shown as \$39.85 million in net present value (NPV). flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits are calculated using the HAZUS model, based on an

assessment of four possible flood events with return intervals of 10, 25, 50, and 100 years. FLO 2-D modeling is used for hydrologic analysis supporting the probability of flood, inundation areas, and depths. The main categories of damage avoided are residential and commercial structures, debris removal, vehicle damage, and displaced residents.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that 4 program preferences and 4 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for only 7 of the preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; 3) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; 4) Climate Change Response Actions; 5) Expand Environmental Stewardship; 6) Practice Integrated Flood Management; and 7) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.